
The Present Day Phase of the Monroe Doctrine

Author(s): F. E. Chadwick

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Jan., 1914), pp. 306-318

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29737999>

Accessed: 27-07-2014 22:03 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

THE PRESENT DAY PHASE OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

*By F. E. Chadwick, Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Formerly President of the Naval War College; Chief
of Staff to Admiral Sampson in the Spanish War*

I think it well that there should from time to time be discussions of our public policies so that their true meaning be kept before the country. Any policy which cannot stand discussion is of course a bad policy, for in a free discussion of any question of policy or politics is our safety. It is the basis of the freedom of which we boast. I thus hope, whatever the views of those concerned, that we shall have a full and frank discussion of the subject in hand.

Before entering on the question itself, I would like to say that we are using an erroneous nomenclature in applying the term "Latin" to those parts of the Americas settled by the Spanish and Portuguese. There is no Latin America in a true sense: but there is an Iberic America settled by the people of the Iberic peninsula, the races in which are still mainly of the old Iberic blood and in no large sense "Latin." I shall have something to say of this later.

I have heard no mention of the actual Doctrine under discussion as it originally stood. I thus venture to say a few words on this.

It was in reality due mainly to John Quincy Adams, Monroe's secretary of state. He first gave it concrete form and was thus its true author. It was by his insistence despite tremblings of the President and the rest of the Cabinet that it appeared in a note read on November 21, 1823, to Baron Tuvill, the Russian Minister, in form as follows:

That the United States of America, and their government could not see with indifference, the forcible interposition of any European power, other than Spain, either to restore the dominion of Spain over her emancipated colonies in America, or to estab-

lish monarchical governments in those countries, or to transfer any of the possessions heretofore or yet subject to Spain in the American hemisphere to any other European power.

As the responsibility of the acceptance of the principle and of its appearance later in fuller form was the President's it very properly took his name.

So early as July 17 of that year Adams had announced this policy to Byron Tully in an official conversation, saying that "we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new colonial establishments." These expressions, those of Adams as well as that fathered by Monroe, were the outcome of the alliance known as Holy, consisting first of Russia, Austria and Prussia. England shortly became a signatory and France became a party in 1818. The alliance in this year stated the "respose of the world" as "constantly their motive and end." To assist Spain in reducing to obedience her revolted American provinces was one of the means proposed. England under the guidance of George Canning, one of the greatest of her statesmen at any period, withdrew from the alliance. Canning's attitude and the pronouncement in Monroe's message on the meeting of congress December 21, 1823, gave a quietus to any proposed interference with the Spanish provinces, which one by one became independent except Cuba and Puerto Rico. Brazil declared independence of Portugal with a scion of Portuguese royalty as emperor.

We thus very materially assisted Mexico and the South American republics in establishing their nationality. That we had none but the vaguest ideas regarding the conditions of these various countries, the character and temperament of the populations, goes without saying. We know all too little of them now, and, particularly, we know, or at least take to heart, but little of the race characteristics of the governing class small in numbers and which, in all but Brazil where it is Portuguese, is of Spanish blood. The Anglo-Saxon is proverbially slow and weak in the acquirement or at least in the application of such race knowledge. The great mass of our people are apt to assign to all races their own qualities; to believe

that what we wish to do is a sign of what they must wish. That the South American states had the wish to follow our experiment in government is undoubtedly true. But to wish and to do are different things. They all, except Brazil, sat at our feet so to speak; formed their constitutions upon ours and started upon the road to freedom which only led them, in their case, into the slough of almost incessant revolution and political convulsion. Back of their wish was the great dominant power of race temperament which governs and ever will govern in great degree all effort. The fateful inheritance was the oriental temperament of the Spaniards, for the Spaniard in the main is not a European, but a child of the orient. Basically he is a Berber, for such was the ancient Iberian, which probably has its root in the word Berber, and his near relatives are the Berbers today of the Atlas, and the Moors of Morocco; and farther back the Arab and the latter's kindred races. These races have never got rid of their tribal tendencies and it is this tendency which accounts for the subjugation of Spain by the Atlas Berbers and Moors in 700, for the downfall of their power 800 years later; for the constant regionalism of Spain which exists even today and prevents a real solidarity of the various kingdoms of Spain, and for the frequent revolutions and upheavals of the Mexican and South American republics. It is in the nature of the Spanish (and governing) part of their population. This tendency will be modified as the native races and their mixture with the whites increase in comparison with the pure white. It is estimated that already in Mexico the population in nineteenth-twentieths Indian. It is only the phlegmatic character of the race and their want of assertiveness which prevents their having a greater influence. Thus the Mexican revolutions are the outcome of the exploitation of the weaker and milder race by but about a million of people of the restless Spanish or nearly Spanish blood, the character of the dominancy of which is shown by the casting sometimes of less than 18,000 votes in a presidential election in a population of about 18,000,000. Notwithstanding, and though very few can be said to be republics in any but

name, certain of these countries by reason of race mixture and pressure of commercial interests, have already grown out of their chaotic conditions. Argentina is today a well ordered prosperous country, rich beyond even North American ideas and with a capital city, Buenos Aires, of a population of over a million, a rival in construction, well-being, appearance and wealth of any city in the world. The country, mainly temperate in climate and well nigh half the size of the United States, has a great destiny. It is undoubtedly one of the seats of empire. It is beyond the stage when it can be patronized. The same may be said of Chile and Brazil though the last (never revolutionary in an extreme sense) is immensely handicapped by its non-homogeneous population, so largely negro and Indian and of a mixture of both these with the white. In all the other states, except Uruguay which is still perhaps the most truly Spanish in blood, the mixture is chiefly Indian, as in Mexico. We have thus in our dealings with the regions to the south of us, to consider powers racially so different from ourselves that our understanding of one another is extremely difficult. The polite and ceremonious South American of Spanish descent cannot understand our rudeness of manner, our overbearingness, our want of that courtesy in general on which the Spaniard lays a stress which the North American mind fails wholly to comprehend. And, too, for generations, we sent to South America many diplomatic and consular representatives who misrepresented sadly their country. I could tell some very queer stories of such. Our government in later years has come to understand the necessity of sending a higher class of representatives, but it will take long to dispel the old impressions.

Naturally with such impressions immensely accentuated by racial and lingual differences, the southern republics have turned to Europe rather than to us for trade, travel and amusements. Brazil and the countries south are also much nearer Europe than to us, so that everything has worked against an actual drawing together of these regions and ourselves.

It has seemed necessary to say so much of conditions,

as they are closely related to any discussion of the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine today.

That there is any danger to Brazil, Argentina or Chile, such as was existent in 1823, it is impossible to believe. Undoubtedly these now comparatively powerful countries would stand together were either attacked with a view to subjugation, by a European power. Such an alliance is in itself an all sufficient Monroe Doctrine in so far as the establishment of a European hegemony in the southern and south-eastern part of South America is concerned. I thus am of the opinion that we need not concern ourselves about such a danger more than to declare a readiness to join with these three principal powers in case such emergency should arise. But I am convinced that no such emergency will arise through any European power, though there is a volume of immigration which is sure to change the predominance in importance of the Portuguese blood in southern Brazil and that of the Spanish in Uruguay, Argentina and more slowly in Chile. For more than ninety years there has been emigration from Germany to South Brazil, and the 110,000 who have come to southern Brazil between 1820 and 1911 amount today to more than 300,000 by far the greater number of whom know of course no other fatherland. There are also today hundreds of thousands of Italians chiefly of the better north Italian stock and who, in Brazil are chiefly a little to the north of the Germanic region. But these people whatever may come (and it must be kept in mind that migration to South America is Latin in enormous proportion, the German, to Brazil being not more than 4000 a year), will never put themselves under the government of a European power. Should Brazil, which be it remembered is considerably larger than the United States, leaving aside Alaska, ever separate into a north and a south through racial differences, the south would either set up its own government or attach itself to Argentina which in time may control the whole of the river Plate region. I would say however that I regard any danger of separation, by reason of race, extremely unlikely in that

the northern states are destined to be peopled by those of a blood whose special characteristic is subordination. In any case even were there a fear of European difficulty it would seem the part of wisdom to encourage the filling up of these vast spaces where possible by a better sort of man than the negro or Indian. It would be better far, for Brazil and the world, if the Germans in Brazil numbered millions where they are now only a few hundreds of thousands. If in time Germanic blood became the chief element, the state would still be Brazil, but a Brazil of a higher type intellectually and economically. We must not lose sight of race values, and this question is thus to Brazil of the most momentous character. Of its population of about 19,000,000, much the largest population is negro, mixed negro and white and Indian. The whites predominate in numbers in the further south only.

While this south is largely a high table land, the northern interior is chiefly a vast low-lying region all well within the tropics and with the tepid climate in which the white can never thrive. Escaping disease, as at Panama, is one thing, thriving in such a climate is another, and however strenuous may be the endeavor to people the whole of Brazil with white men it must be to a very great extent a failure. At least two-thirds of her territory must in time be the abode of colored races, and in time there will be in most parts but very few pure whites.

We thus need not concern ourselves about European emigration to Brazil north of Rio Janeiro; nature will take care of that part of the problem.

While there are great regions to which the white man will not go to establish himself permanently, the colored races are able to thrive even in fairly cold climates. Thus the facts just stated open up a problem more vast and momentous to us than our slavery question; that is shall we approach the Brazilian conditions?

However kindly our feeling, we can not but recognize that some races make a more valuable return to the species than others. We preach greatly what we now term eugenics which translated broadly means the production of

the best man. We are faced in our own country by this question in a more serious form than is any other great nation. A tenth of our population is now negro which is rapidly in the north mixing with the white; the incoming population is largely itself negroid, particularly that from the Portuguese islands, less markedly from Portugal itself and markedly from Sicily and Naples. Many thousands of jet black negroes calling themselves Portuguese, as they are under the flag, have entered Massachusetts from the Cape Verde Islands in the last few years and every Cape Verde Islander will finally come and help his fellows pick cranberries on Cape Cod, or work in the New Bedford mills. The census gives nearly 50,000 negroes as part of our population not born in the United States, and there are undoubtedly many more than the census notes. The time is rapidly approaching when we may expect a great immigration from the Congo basin of Africa. It becomes a mighty question which it behooves us to consider, and that soon. Says Pearson, in his *National Life and Character*, and he saw farther into the future than most of his time:

The distant future of a country is so unimportant by the side of its immediate needs to the men in possession that even if they were reasonably certain that a particular evil ought to be guarded against at an immediate sacrifice, they would rarely be possessed of the moral force required for the effort.

Shall we have this moral force in the matter of Africa whose millions will undoubtedly before long be at our doors? If not, the present differentiation in character between ourselves and Mexico and much of South America will in no very distant time disappear and we shall have approximated a general likeness in both parts of our hemisphere. It is a matter for our most serious thought, to which at the moment I can give but bare mention, but I would that you would hold it in earnest thought. Shall we have and display that patriotism of race, to use a phrase of Arthur Balfour's, which alone can save us from being a negroid nation? If it is a vital question; one before which the questions involved in the Monroe Doctrine shrink to insignificance.

The Monroe Doctrine does not necessarily involve opposing any warlike action between a European power and an American nationality, for an offense which necessarily calls for such action. This part of the subject is covered by Mr. Seward's despatch, 2 June, 1866, to our minister in Chile regarding the hostilities then active between Spain and Chile. The gist of this despatch is that "the republican system" in any South American State,

shall not be wantonly assailed and that it shall not be subverted as an end of a lawful war by European powers. . . . We concede to every nation the right to make peace or war, for such causes other than political or ambitious, as it thinks right and wise. In such wars as are waged between nations which are in friendship with ourselves, if they are not pushed, like the French war in Mexico, to the political point before mentioned, we do not intervene, but remain neutral conceding nothing to one belligerent that we do not concede to the other and allowing to one belligerent what we allow to the other.¹

This in nowise contravenes the Monroe Declaration which declares that "We should consider any attempt on their part [meaning the European powers] to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety," that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them [the South American states], or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States." It must be admitted that the word "republican" in Mr. Seward's dispatch, and, which is only implied in the Monroe declaration, is made to cover much which we should be sorry to so term; but in any case the constitutions of all have established such a form as their ideal and they should have full chance to work toward it.

The whole question is thus one of denying the right of a foreign power to dominion in any American state or part of a state nor already in possession of a foreign power. In other words we are very properly opposed to conquest.

While holding that as to the more southern governments of South America our relations should be as a fourth equal

¹ Diplom. Cor. 1866, part 2, p. 413.

with a like understanding as to attempted foreign domination, and not in the nature of a protector which carries with it an idea of patronage, the matter stands on a very different footing as to the regions bordering on the Caribbean sea and the Gulf of Mexico, and on that part of the Pacific in the neighborhood of the Panama Canal. That we must have and exercise a commanding influence in these regions should go without saying. We can brook no increase of foreign control in this region. Our newly established gateway between the two great oceans and the protection of this vital link in our defensive system demand this independent of any question of the Monroe Doctrine. Thus in addition to our policy of aiding in the preservation of any South American state from foreign control, we would oppose anything like new occupancy of any of the West India Islands or Caribbean or Gulf of Mexico litoral, or any part of the Pacific litoral of Mexico or the Central American states, or neighboring islands, such, for example, as the Galápagos.

There are of course already in the hands of foreign nations commanding points in the Caribbean region, as Jamaica, (the most commanding as a single point of all), in possession of the English, St. Thomas which is Danish, Martinique and Guadeloupe which are French. All the important West India Islands are in fact in European possession except Cuba, Santo Domingo and Puerto Rico. It is not unreasonable, as a mere matter of safeguarding our own shores, to demand that there should be no extension of foreign occupancy in this region. In this we are looking after not the safety of any Central or South American state, but our own safety from a naval or military standpoint. The Panama Canal is the very navel of our system, strategic and commercial. Our battle fleet for instance could reach San Francisco from the Caribbean in a fourth of the time taken by the *Oregon* in her famous passage from San Francisco to the Caribbean. Any foreign action which could look to weakening our control of the canal and its approaches thus could not be tolerated.

I am well aware that there are probably some who lay

no stress upon such matters, but it would appear the part of wisdom to apply to the future the lessons of the past. Jefferson, more than a hundred years ago, failed to do this and thus subjected his country to inexpressible humiliation in the seizure of our ships and seamen, to the loss of millions of American property and to the war of 1812, which would never have occurred had we had the dozen or so of battle-ships which even Gallatin, Jefferson's secretary of the treasury, urged upon him. We speak of modern dictatorship on the part of our presidents; no modern president has exercised a tithe of that exercised by Jefferson in these matters and not always to his country's good. There is in such matters but one safe course. All the world will not always shape itself to one's own special views, and for the time at least, it is better to be prepared to resist if struck. If not, it is possible that we might find ourselves the victim in considerable degree, of that which the Monroe Doctrine was established to prevent for others. A first consideration must ever be national security and safety. Some here no doubt are opposed to a strong navy. To such I would recall that it was to the French navy by its occupancy of the Chesapeake in 1781 and the consequent surrender of Cornwallis, that we gained our independence. For had Washington's venture south failed, the Revolution would have failed. It was a last attempt. Had we had no navy in 1812 (and it was but a very little one), we should then have undergone greater humiliation ashore than we did and perhaps dismemberment. Without the navy of the Civil War, the South beyond any reasonable doubt would have succeeded. It was the blockade which starved it to inanition. The world has not so changed in fifty years as to make a war of conquest impossible. It is but a little over forty years when France was in the grip of Germany. We cannot apply our own altruism to others, and as I see it, it appears beyond discussion that our own safety depends upon our ability to take care of our own. Remember that in June, 1860, the only increase of the navy even suggested, was for a few light draft steamers for use in suppression of the slave trade on the coast of Africa, and

every increase was voted down. Less than a year later we began the greatest war of the century.

To assume an attitude; to have a world policy and not be able to hold it, would be to make ourselves absurd and open to humiliation and loss of territory. So much at least is axiomatic. I say these truths "Lest we forget."

The Monroe Doctrine is not in any of its meanings or forms a part of international law. It is but a pronouncement of a policy and as such it may be ignored by any power which chooses to ignore it. It has life and being only as long as the United States is ready to back such policy by force. That there is any danger of action by any European power in defiance of the policy does not now at least, appear. Certainly England has no interest in so doing; there is no sign that Germany wishes to set up a German state under Germany's hegemony. That she desires as many Germans in South America who through natural affiliation would trade largely with Germany is natural and proper, but she would certainly not risk a war with united Brazil, Argentina, and Chile, not to speak of the United States, to bring under her dominion the region occupied by her emigrants. I have ever deemed any such question of war with Germany as impossible. So long as the great Slav question is so imminent; so long as France nurses her feeling for her loss of territory and England, however unreasoningly, her fear of Germany instigated by commercial jealousy, there will be no reaching out by the latter for South American dominion. France has not the remotest desire to set up a French dominion there, nor has Italy, and England declared some eighteen months since through her foreign minister speaking in parliament, that as she had no wish or intention to extend her possessions either in the West Indies or on the continent, she took no exception to the Monroe Doctrine which was purely a question of American policy to do with as we thought best. The danger in the sense of Monroe's pronouncement could thus only exist after a complete effacement of American power, north and south.

Thus to sum up: our most reasonable attitude as to any

question of conquest or occupancy of any part of South America would be as a friendly fourth party to the three greater powers of the southern part of our hemisphere, Brazil, Argentina and Chile, assuring them that our policy would be one of support in the questions involved in the Monroe Doctrine and of looking after our special interests in the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico and near Pacific as just defined.

Our action in regard to certain of the Central American states and Santo Domingo has been, in some cases, sharply criticised. But such procedure, as I see it, has nothing in itself to do with the Monroe Doctrine. There are many precedents for such action, and if it be that of a truly friendly and well-wishing neighbor it is correct diplomatically and morally. Of course the most extreme precedent is that of the Holy Alliance itself, as overtly shown in Naples, Piedmont, and Spain. But there are other and more worthy instances, as the intervention of France, Great Britain and Russia in 1827 for the pacification of Greece; the late action of the European powers in Crete; of Great Britain in Egypt; of Russia and Great Britain in Persia (to which the word "worthy" can however not be assigned); the action of the powers in forcing a treaty upon the parties to the Balkan war, and many others, which place such action as ours in Nicaragua and Santo Domingo upon a perfectly correct diplomatic footing. Such precedents would justify intervention in Mexico if the worst came to the worst. In saying this I would not be understood as declaring such action advisable except in the last extremity. It would strain our political system to the utmost; would involve an army of half a million men, an indefinite administration of a vast region and the government for years of some 17,000,000 or more of races alien in temperament, habits, customs, language and religion. Far better, from only a financial point of view, would it be for us to buy up every foreign interest in Mexico. We have through our pension laws bound ourselves hand and foot against the active use of a great army. We should end any effort

at occupation and pacification (should it ever end) with a pension list swollen to such gigantic proportions that our finances would go to wreck under the burden. And above all how under our system could we govern it? And this last question is above all others. I can see in such an effort nothing but disaster. I thus say as to such procedure, God forbid!

With this I close, except to say that I think our relations to our brother republics to the south should be governed by every possible consideration for their temperament and care for their prejudices; that our diplomatic and consular representatives should be of a character to command wholly their liking and respect, and that we should appear in all matters concerning Pan-American questions as an equal only among equals, determined to do the just, the equitable and the kindly. On such a basis there would be no difficulty regarding the Monroe Doctrine.